# THE LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY SITE-WIDE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PROCESS

The United States Department of Energy (DOE) has a policy (10 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1021.330) of preparing a Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) for certain large, multiple-facility sites, such as the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). The purpose of a SWEIS is to provide DOE and its stakeholders with an analysis of the environmental impacts resulting from ongoing and reasonably foreseeable new operations and facilities and reasonable alternatives at the DOE site. The SWEIS analyzes four alternatives for the continued operation of LANL to identify the potential effects that each alternative could have on the human environment.

The SWEIS Advance Notice of Intent, published in the *Federal Register* (FR) on August 10, 1994 (59 FR 40889), identified possible issues and alternatives to be analyzed. Based on public input received during prescoping, DOE published the Notice of Intent to prepare the SWEIS in the *Federal Register* on May 12, 1995 (60 FR 25697). DOE held a series of public meetings during prescoping and scoping to provide opportunities for stakeholders to identify the issues, environmental concerns, and alternatives that should be analyzed in the SWEIS. An Implementation Plan<sup>1</sup> was published in November 1995 to summarize the results of scoping, describe the scope of the SWEIS based on the scoping process, and present an outline for the draft SWEIS. The Implementation Plan also included a discussion of the issues reflected in public comments during scoping.

In addition to the required meetings and documents described above, the SWEIS process has included a number of other activities intended to enhance public participation in this effort. These activities have included:

- Workshops to develop the Greener Alternative described and analyzed in the SWEIS.
- Meetings with and briefings to representatives of federal, state, tribal, and local governments during prescoping, scoping, and preparation of the draft SWEIS.
- Preparation and submission to the Los Alamos Community Outreach Center of information requested by members of the public related to LANL operations and proposed projects.
- Numerous Open Forum public meetings in the communities around LANL to discuss LANL activities, the status of the SWEIS, and other issues raised by the public.

The draft SWEIS was distributed to interested stakeholders for comment. The comment period extended from May 15, 1998, to July 15, 1998. Public hearings on the draft SWEIS were announced in the *Federal Register*, as well as community newspapers and radio broadcasts. Public hearings were held in Los Alamos, Santa Fe, and Española, New Mexico, on June 9, 1998, June 10, 1998, and June 24, 1998, respectively.

Oral and written comments were accepted during the 60-day comment period for the draft SWEIS. All comments received, whether orally or in writing, were considered in preparation of the final SWEIS. The final SWEIS includes a new volume IV with responses to individual comments and a discussion of general major issues. DOE will prepare a Record of Decision no sooner than 30 days after the final SWEIS Notice of Availability is published in the *Federal Register*. The Record of Decision will describe the rationale used for DOE's selection of an alternative or portions of the alternatives. Following the issuance of the Record of Decision, a Mitigation Action Plan may also be issued to describe any mitigation measures that DOE commits to in concert with its decision.

<sup>1.</sup> DOE *National Environmental Policy Act* regulations (10 CFR 1021) previously required that an implementation plan be prepared; a regulation change (61 FR 64604) deleted this requirement. An implementation plan was prepared for this SWEIS.

#### **COVER SHEET**

**Responsible Agency:** U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

Cooperating Agency: Incorporated County of Los Alamos

Title: Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement for the Continued Operation of the

Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico (DOE/EIS-0238)

**Contact:** For further information concerning this Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement

(SWEIS), contact:

Corey Cruz, Project Manager U.S. DOE, Albuquerque Operations Office P.O. Box 5400, Albuquerque, NM 87185

Telephone: 505–845–4282 Fax: 505–845–6392

For general information on DOE's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, contact:

Carol Borgstrom, Director
Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–42)
U.S. DOE, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585
Telephone: 202–586–4600 or leave a message at 1–800–472–2756

Abstract: DOE proposes to continue operating the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) located in Los Alamos County, in north-central New Mexico. DOE has identified and assessed four alternatives for the operation of LANL: (1) No Action, (2) Expanded Operations, (3) Reduced Operations, and (4) Greener. Expanded Operations is DOE's Preferred Alternative, with the exception that DOE would only implement pit manufacturing at a level of 20 pits per year. In the No Action Alternative, DOE would continue the historical mission support activities LANL has conducted at planned operational levels. In the Expanded Operations Alternative, DOE would operate LANL at the highest levels of activity currently foreseeable, including full implementation of the mission assignments from recent programmatic documents. Under the Reduced Operations Alternative, DOE would operate LANL at the minimum levels of activity necessary to maintain the capabilities to support the DOE mission in the near term. Under the Greener Alternative, DOE would operate LANL to maximize operations in support of nonproliferation, basic science, materials science, and other nonweapons areas, while minimizing weapons activities. Under all of the alternatives, the affected environment is primarily within 50 miles (80 kilometers) of LANL. Analyses indicate little difference in the environmental impacts among alternatives. discriminators are: collective worker risk due to radiation exposure, socioeconomic effects due to LANL employment changes, and electrical power demand.

**Public Comment and DOE Decision:** The draft SWEIS was released to the public for review and comment on May 15, 1998. The comment period extended until July 15, 1998, although late comments were accepted to the extent practicable. All comments received were considered in preparation of the final SWEIS<sup>1</sup>. DOE will utilize the analysis in this final SWEIS and prepare a Record of Decision on the level of continued operation of LANL. This decision will be no sooner than 30 days after the Notice of Availability of the final SWEIS is published in the *Federal Register*.

<sup>1.</sup> Changes made to this SWEIS since publication of the draft SWEIS are marked with a vertical bar to the right or left of the text.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of	f Conte	nts	:		
List of I	Figures.		XX		
List of 7	Γables .		xxvi		
Abbrevi	Abbreviations and Acronyms				
Measure					
CHAPT	ΓER 1.(				
INTRO	DUCT	ION AND PURPOSE AND NEED FOR AGENCY ACTION	1–1		
1.1	LANI	SUPPORT FOR DOE MISSIONS	1–1		
	1.1.1	National Security Assignments to LANL	1–		
		1.1.1.1 Stockpile Stewardship Assignments			
		1.1.1.2 Stockpile Management Assignments			
		1.1.1.3 Accelerator Production of Tritium Assignment	1–6		
		1.1.1.4 Stabilization of Commercial Nuclear Materials Assignment	1–7		
		1.1.1.5 Nonproliferation and Counter-Proliferation Assignments	1–7		
		1.1.1.6 Other National Security Assignments	1–8		
	1.1.2	Energy Resources Assignments	1–8		
	1.1.3	Environmental Quality Assignments	1–8		
	1.1.4	Science Assignments	1–9		
		1.1.4.1 Nuclear Criticality Studies	1–9		
		1.1.4.2 Reimbursable Work	1–9		
		1.1.4.3 University Research and Development	1–10		
	1.1.5	DOE National Laboratory System	1–10		
1.2	PURPO	OSE AND NEED FOR AGENCY ACTION	1–10		
1.3	OVER	VIEW OF THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	1–12		
1.4	DECIS	TIONS TO BE SUPPORTED BY THE SWEIS	1–13		
	1.4.1	Public Comment Process on the Draft SWEIS			
1.5	RELAT	TIONSHIP TO OTHER DOE NEPA DOCUMENTS	1–13		
	1.5.1	Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0200)	1–14		
	1.5.2	Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0236)	1–15		
	1.5.3	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Disposal Phase Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0026-S2)	1–17		

	1.5.4	Medical Isotopes Production Project: Molybdenum-99 and Related Isotopes Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0249)	. 1–18	
	1.5.5	Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0229)	. 1–18	
	1.5.6	EIS on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (DOE/EIS-0277)	. 1–19	
	1.5.7	Pit Disassembly and Conversion Demonstration Environmental Assessment (DOE/EA–1207)	. 1–19	
	1.5.8	Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0283)	. 1–20	
	1.5.9	EIS for Siting, Construction, and Operation of the Spallation Neutron Source (DOE/EIS-0247)	. 1–20	
	1.5.10	EIS for the Proposed Conveyance and Transfer of Certain Land Tracts Located Within Los Alamos and Santa Fe Counties and Los Alamos National Laboratory	. 1–21	
	1.5.11	Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Strategic Computing Complex (DOE/EA-1250)	. 1–21	
1.6	OVERVIEW OF THE LANL SWEIS			
	1.6.1	Objectives of the SWEIS	. 1–22	
	1.6.2	SWEIS Approaches	. 1–22	
	1.6.3	Consideration of Future Projects	. 1–23	
		1.6.3.1 Emerging Actions at LANL	. 1–24	
	1.6.4	Cooperating Agency	. 1–25	
	1.6.5	Organization of the SWEIS	. 1–25	
1.7	CHANG	GES TO THE DRAFT SWEIS	. 1–27	
	1.7.1	Summary of Significant Changes	. 1–27	
		1.7.1.1 Revised Preferred Alternative		
		1.7.1.2 Enhanced Pit Manufacturing	. 1–27	
		1.7.1.3 Wildfire	. 1–28	
		1.7.1.4 Comparison Between the Rocky Flats Plant and LANL	. 1–28	
		1.7.1.5 CMR Building Seismic Upgrades	. 1–28	
		1.7.1.6 Strategic Computing Complex		
		1.7.1.7 Conveyance and Transfer of DOE Land		
	1.7.2	Next Steps	. 1–29	
Dee	SDEMOS		1 21	

BACK		ND ON LC	OS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY TVITIES	2 1
2.1			ANL ACTIVITIES	
	2.1.1	_	es of Direct-Funded Activities	
		2.1.1.1	Theory, Modeling, and High Performance Computing	
		2.1.1.2	Experimental Science and Engineering	2–2
		2.1.1.3	Advanced and Nuclear Materials Research, Development, and Applications	2–3
	2.1.2	Supportin	ng Activities	2–4
		2.1.2.1	Waste Management	2–4
		2.1.2.2	Infrastructure and Central Services	2–6
		2.1.2.3	Maintenance and Refurbishment	2–6
		2.1.2.4	Environmental, Ecological, and Natural Resources  Management Activities	2–8
		2.1.2.5	Environmental Restoration	2–9
	2.1.3	Responsil	bilities for Safe Operations at LANL	2–14
		2.1.3.1	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	
2.2	DESCI	RIPTION OF	LANL FACILITIES	2–16
	2.2.1	Technical	l Areas	2–17
	2.2.2		Key Facilities	
		2.2.2.1	Plutonium Facility Complex (TA–55)	
		2.2.2.2	Tritium Facilities (TA–16, TA–21)	
		2.2.2.3	Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building (TA-3-29)	
		2.2.2.4	Pajarito Site: Los Alamos Critical Experiments Facility	
			(TA-18)	2–46
		2.2.2.5	Sigma Complex (TA–3–66, TA–3–35, TA–3–141, and TA–3–159)	
		2.2.2.6	Materials Science Laboratory (TA–3–1698)	
		2.2.2.7	Target Fabrication Facility (TA–35)	
		2.2.2.8	Machine Shops (TA-3)	
		2.2.2.9	High Explosives Processing	
		2.2.2.10	High Explosives Testing: TA–14 (Q-Site), TA–15 (R-Site), TA–36 (Kappa-Site), TA–39 (Ancho Canyon Site), and	
			TA-40 (DF-Site)	
		2.2.2.11	Los Alamos Neutron Science Center (TA-53)	2–84
		2.2.2.12	Health Research Laboratory (TA-43)	2–92
		2.2.2.13	Radiochemistry Facility (TA-48)	2–95
		2 2 2 14	Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (TA=50)	2_90

		2.2.2.15	(TA-54 and TA-50)	2–103
	2.2.3		nd Moderate Hazard Facilities Not Analyzed as Key	2 116
		2.2.3.1	Hazard Category 2 Nuclear Facilities	
		2.2.3.1	Hazard Category 3 Nuclear Facilities	
		2.2.3.3	Nonnuclear Moderate Hazard Facilities	
2.3	THE R		E UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IN LANL ACTIVITIES	
2.4			UNDING LEVELS	
REF	ERENCE	5		2–121
CHAD	ΓER 3.0			
			THE CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE	
LOS A	LAMOS	SNATION	AL LABORATORY	3–1
3.1	No Ac	TION ALTE	ERNATIVE	3–4
	3.1.1	Plutonium	n Facility Complex	3–4
	3.1.2		acilities	
	3.1.3	Chemistry	and Metallurgy Research Building	3–7
	3.1.4	Pajarito S	ite (Los Alamos Critical Experiments Facility)	3–8
	3.1.5	Sigma Co	mplex	3–8
	3.1.6	Materials	Science Laboratory	3–9
	3.1.7	Target Fal	brication Facility	3–9
	3.1.8	Machine S	Shops	3–9
	3.1.9	High Expl	losives Processing Facilities	3–10
	3.1.10	High Exp	losives Testing	3–10
	3.1.11	Los Alam	os Neutron Science Center	3–11
	3.1.12	Health Re	search Laboratory	3–13
			mistry Facility	
	3.1.14	Radioacti	ve Liquid Waste Treatment Facility	3–14
	3.1.15	Solid Rad	ioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities	3–14
3.2	EXPAN	DED OPER	RATIONS ALTERNATIVE	3–16
	3.2.1	Plutonium	n Facility Complex	3–17
	3.2.2		acilities	
	3.2.3		and Metallurgy Research Building	
	3.2.4	-	ite (Los Alamos Critical Experiments Facility)	
		Sigma Co		3_21

	3.2.6	Materials Science Laboratory	3–22
	3.2.7	Target Fabrication Facility	3–22
	3.2.8	Machine Shops	3–23
	3.2.9	High Explosives Processing Facilities	3–23
	3.2.10	High Explosives Testing	3–24
	3.2.11	Los Alamos Neutron Science Center	3–24
	3.2.12	Health Research Laboratory	3–27
	3.2.13	Radiochemistry Facility	3–28
	3.2.14	Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility	3–28
	3.2.15	Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities	3–29
3.3	REDUC	EED OPERATIONS ALTERNATIVE	3–30
	3.3.1	Plutonium Facility Complex	3–31
	3.3.2	Tritium Facilities	3–32
	3.3.3	Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building	3–32
	3.3.4	Pajarito Site (Los Alamos Critical Experiments Facility)	3–33
	3.3.5	Sigma Complex	3–34
	3.3.6	Materials Science Laboratory	3–34
	3.3.7	Target Fabrication Facility	3–34
	3.3.8	Machine Shops	3–34
	3.3.9	High Explosives Processing Facilities	3–35
	3.3.10	High Explosives Testing	3–35
	3.3.11	Los Alamos Neutron Science Center	3–35
	3.3.12	Health Research Laboratory	3–36
	3.3.13	Radiochemistry Facility	3–37
	3.3.14	Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility	3–37
	3.3.15	Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities	3–38
3.4	GREEN	ier Alternative	3–39
	3.4.1	Plutonium Facility Complex	3–40
	3.4.2	Tritium Facilities	3–41
	3.4.3	Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building	3–42
	3.4.4	Pajarito Site (Los Alamos Critical Experiments Facility)	3-42
	3.4.5	Sigma Complex	3–43
	3.4.6	Materials Science Laboratory	3–43
	3.4.7	Target Fabrication Facility	3–44
	3.4.8	Machine Shops	3–44
	3.4.9	High Explosives Processing Facilities	3–45

	3.4.10	High Exp	losives Testing	3–45
	3.4.11	Los Alam	os Neutron Science Center	3–45
	3.4.12	Health Re	esearch Laboratory	3–47
	3.4.13	Radioche	mistry Facility	3–47
	3.4.14	Radioacti	ve Liquid Waste Treatment Facility	3–48
	3.4.15	Solid Rad	lioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities	3–48
3.5			CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL IN	3–49
	3.5.1	Decontan	nination and Decommissioning LANL	3–50
	3.5.2		on of All Weapons-Related Work (Including Stockpile hip and Management) from Continued Operation of LANL	3–50
	3.5.3	Operating	g LANL Exclusively as a National Environmental	
		Research	Park	3–51
	3.5.4	Privatizin	g the Operations of LANL	3–52
3.6	Сомр	ARISON OF	POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES AMONG ALTERNATIVES	
	FOR C	ONTINUED	OPERATION OF LANL	3–53
	3.6.1	_	of Differences in Activities Among the SWEIS Alternatives	
	3.6.2	Conseque	ences of SWEIS Alternatives	
		3.6.2.1	Land Resources	
		3.6.2.2	Geology, Geological Conditions, and Soils	
		3.6.2.3	Water Resources	
		3.6.2.4	Air Quality	
		3.6.2.5	Ecological and Biological Resources	
		3.6.2.6	Human Health	
		3.6.2.7	Environmental Justice	
		3.6.2.8	Cultural Resources	
		3.6.2.9	Socioeconomics, Infrastructure, and Waste Management	
		3.6.2.10	Transportation	3–58
		3.6.2.11	Accidents (Other Than Transportation Accidents and Worker Physical Safety Incidents/Accidents)	3–59
	3.6.3	Project-S <sub>1</sub>	pecific Consequences	3–62
		3.6.3.1	Expansion of TA–54/Area G Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Area	3–62
		3.6.3.2	Enhancement of Plutonium Pit Manufacturing	3–65
	3.6.4	Conseque	ences of Environmental Restoration Activities	3–70
ъ				0 145

_	ΓER 4.( CTED E		MENT	4–1
4.1	LAND	RESOURCE	ES	4–3
	4.1.1		e	
		4.1.1.1	Stewardship and Land Use Authority	
		4.1.1.2	LANL Land Use	
		4.1.1.3	Los Alamos County Land Use	4–7
		4.1.1.4	Potential Land Transfers and Related Land Use Issues	4–9
		4.1.1.5	Santa Fe National Forest Land Use	4–10
		4.1.1.6	Bandelier National Monument Land Use	4–10
		4.1.1.7	American Indian Pueblo Land Use	4–13
	4.1.2	Visual E	nvironment	4–14
		4.1.2.1	Physical Characteristics Within the Visual Environment	4–14
		4.1.2.2	Air Quality and Light Pollution Within the Visual	
			Environment	4–16
	4.1.3	Noise, A	ir Blasts, and Vibration Environment	4–16
		4.1.3.1	Noise Level Regulatory Limits and LANL Administrative	
			Requirements	
		4.1.3.2	Existing LANL Noise Air Blast and Vibration Environment	4–19
4.2	GEOL	OGY AND S	SOILS	4–22
	4.2.1	Geology		4–22
	4.2.2	Geologic	Conditions	4–26
		4.2.2.1	Volcanism	4–26
		4.2.2.2	Seismic Activity	4–27
		4.2.2.3	Slope Stability, Subsidence, and Soil Liquefaction	4–34
	4.2.3	Soils		4–34
		4.2.3.1	Soil Monitoring	4–34
		4.2.3.2	Soil Erosion	4–39
	4.2.4	Mineral l	Resources	4–40
	4.2.5	Paleonto	logical Resources	4–40
4.3	WATE	R RESOUR	CES	4–42
	4.3.1		Water	
		4.3.1.1	Surface Water Monitoring	
		4.3.1.2	Surface Water Quality Standards	
		4.3.1.3	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	
			Permitted Outfalls	4–52
		4.3.1.4	Sediments	4–63

		4.3.1.5	Surface Water Quality	4–68
		4.3.1.6	Floodplains	4–69
	4.3.2	Groundwa	ater Resources	4–70
		4.3.2.1	Groundwater Monitoring	4–72
		4.3.2.2	Groundwater Quality	4–75
		4.3.2.3	Transport of Radionuclides and Chemicals	4–78
		4.3.2.4	Public Water Supply	4–79
		4.3.2.5	Regional Groundwater	4–82
4.4	Air Q	UALITY AN	D CLIMATE	4–83
	4.4.1	Climatolo	ogy and Meteorology	4–83
		4.4.1.1	Wind Conditions	4–86
		4.4.1.2	Severe Weather	4–88
	4.4.2	Nonradio	logical Air Quality	4–88
		4.4.2.1	Applicable Requirements and Guidelines	4–88
		4.4.2.2	Sources of Nonradiological Emissions	4–89
		4.4.2.3	Existing Ambient Air Conditions	4–90
	4.4.3	Radiologi	ical Air Quality	4–90
		4.4.3.1	Radiological Emissions and Monitoring	4–91
		4.4.3.2	Radiological Emission Standards	4–92
		4.4.3.3	Radiation Doses from LANL Airborne Emissions	4–92
	4.4.4	Visibility		4–93
4.5	Ecolo	OGICAL RES	SOURCES AND BIODIVERSITY	4–95
	4.5.1	Ecologica	al Resources	4–95
		4.5.1.1	A Regional Approach	4–95
		4.5.1.2	Wetlands	4–98
		4.5.1.3	Canyons	4–107
		4.5.1.4	Rio Grande	
		4.5.1.5	Protected and Sensitive Species	4–112
		4.5.1.6	Management Plans	4–119
		4.5.1.7	Environmental Surveillance	4–119
	4.5.2	Biodivers	ity Considerations	4–120
		4.5.2.1	Physical Alteration of the Landscape	4–120
		4.5.2.2	Disruption of Natural Processes	4–121
		4.5.2.3	Overharvesting	
		4.5.2.4	Introduction of Nonnative (Exotic) Species	4–122
		4.5.2.5	Pollution	
	4.5.3	Ecologica	al Risk Considerations	4–123
		4531	Background on Contamination at LANL	4_123

		4.5.3.2	Ecological Risk Assessments Performed for Threatened and Endangered Species	4–126	
		4.5.3.3	Ecological Risk		
4.6	Німа	n Heai te	: Worker and Public Health in the Region		
7.0	_		ANL OPERATIONS	4–129	
	4.6.1	Public H	ealth in the LANL Vicinity	4–129	
		4.6.1.1	Radiation in the Environment Around LANL		
		4.6.1.2	Chemicals in the Environment Around LANL	4–132	
		4.6.1.3	Cancer Incidence and Mortality in the Los Alamos Region	4–133	
		4.6.1.4	LANL Environmental Surveillance and Compliance Program	4–137	
	4.6.2	LANL W	Vorker Health	4–137	
		4.6.2.1	Summary of Radiological and Chemical Exposure and Physical Hazard Incidents Affecting Worker Health During the 1990's	4–137	
		4.6.2.2	Ionizing Radiation Exposures of Workers	4–143	
		4.6.2.3	Nonionizing Radiation Exposure		
		4.6.2.4	Summary of Worker Health Studies at LANL	4–144	
		4.6.2.5	LANL Worker Health Programs	4–145	
	4.6.3	Emergen	cy Response and Preparedness Program	4–147	
		4.6.3.1	Emergency Management and Response	4–148	
		4.6.3.2	Emergency Response for Explosions	4–148	
		4.6.3.3	Fire Protection	4–148	
4.7	Envir	ONMENTA	L JUSTICE	4–149	
	4.7.1	Region a	nd Population Considered	4–149	
	4.7.2		Population	4–150	
	4.7.3	Low-Income Population			
4.8	Сигт	TRAL RESC	OURCES	4–157	
	4.8.1		ric Period		
	4.8.2		Period		
	4.8.3		nal Cultural Properties		
	4.8.4		Resource Management at LANL		
4.0					
4.9			CS, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND WASTE MANAGEMENT		
	4.9.1		Domographics		
		4.9.1.1 4.9.1.2	Demographics		
		4.9.1.2	Regional Incomes		
		4.7.1.3	Regional Labor Polee and Educational Attainment	4-104	

		4.9.1.4	The Regional Economy	4–166
		4.9.1.5	The LANL-Affiliated Workforce	4–167
		4.9.1.6	University of California Procurement	4–170
		4.9.1.7	Role of LANL in the Regional Economy	4–170
		4.9.1.8	Community Resources and Social Services	4–172
	4.9.2	LANL Inf	Frastructure and Central Services	4–178
		4.9.2.1	Utilities	4–178
		4.9.2.2	Safeguards and Security	4–184
		4.9.2.3	Fire Protection	4–187
	4.9.3	Waste Ma	nagement	4–187
		4.9.3.1	Wastewater Treatment and Effluent Reduction	4–187
		4.9.3.2	Solid Waste	4–188
		4.9.3.3	Radioactive and Hazardous Waste	4–188
	4.9.4	Contamina	ated Space Within LANL Facilities	4–191
4 10	TRANS	SPORTATION	V	4_195
1.10			and Site Transportation Routes	
			ation Accidents	
		_	ipments	
	4.10.3	4.10.3.1	On-Site Shipments	
		4.10.3.1	Off-Site Shipments	
REF	ERENCE	S		4–203
	TER 5.0			
ENVIR	ONME	NTAL CO	NSEQUENCES	5–1
5.1	IMPAC	T ANALYSI	S METHODOLOGIES	5–3
	5.1.1		ources Methodology	
		5.1.1.1	Land Use	
		5.1.1.2	Visual Resources	5–3
		5.1.1.3	Noise	5–3
	5.1.2	Geology a	and Soils Methodology	5–3
	5.1.3		sources Methodology	
	5.1.4		ty Methodology	
		5.1.4.1	Nonradiological Air Quality	
		5.1.4.2	Radiological Air Quality	
	5.1.5		l Resources, Biodiversity, and Ecological Risk Methodology	
		•	ealth Methodology	5_11

	5.1.7	Environm	ental Justice Methodology	. 5–14
	5.1.8	Cultural R	Resources Methodology	. 5–15
	5.1.9	Socioecon	nomics, Infrastructure, and Waste Management Methodology	. 5–16
		5.1.9.1	Socioeconomics	. 5–16
		5.1.9.2	Infrastructure	. 5–18
		5.1.9.3	Waste Management	. 5–18
		5.1.9.4	Contaminated Space	. 5–18
	5.1.10	Transporta	ation Methodology	. 5–19
		5.1.10.1	Determination of Shipment Amounts, Materials, and Physical Forms	. 5–20
		5.1.10.2	Shipment Routes and Distances	. 5–20
		5.1.10.3	Vehicle-Related Risks	
		5.1.10.4	Cargo-Related Risks	. 5–22
	5.1.11	Accident A	Analysis Methodology	. 5–24
		5.1.11.1	Introduction	
		5.1.11.2	Meaning of Risk and Frequency as Used in This SWEIS	. 5–26
		5.1.11.3	Characterization of the Risk from Accidents	. 5–26
		5.1.11.4	Determining the Increment in Risk Among Alternatives	. 5–27
		5.1.11.5	Methodology for Selection of Accidents for Analysis	. 5–27
		5.1.11.6	Conservatism in the Analyses	. 5–28
		5.1.11.7	Accident Scenario Screening and Selection	. 5–28
		5.1.11.8	Detailed Accident Evaluations	. 5–33
		5.1.11.9	Worker Accident Screening	. 5–34
		5.1.11.10	Detailed Worker Accident Evaluations	. 5–35
		5.1.11.11	Uncertainties and Sensitivities	. 5–35
		5.1.11.12	Summary of Methodology for Supplement Analysis, SSM PEIS	. 5–36
5.2	IMDAC	TO OF THE	No Action Alternative	
).2	5.2.1		Durces	
	3.2.1	5.2.1.1	Land Use	
		5.2.1.1	Visual Resources	
		5.2.1.3	Noise	
	5.2.2		and Soils	
	3.2.2	5.2.2.1	Seismic Events or Volcanic Eruptions	
		5.2.2.2	Slope Stability/Soil Erosion	
		5.2.2.3	Soils	
		5.2.2.4	Mineral Resources	
	5.2.3		Sources	
	5.4.5	5.2.3.1		
		J.2.5.1	Surface Water	. J=41

		5.2.3.2	Groundwater
	5.2.4	Air Quali	ty5–49
		5.2.4.1	Nonradiological Air Quality Impacts
		5.2.4.2	Radiological Air Quality Impacts
	5.2.5	Ecologica	al Resources, Biodiversity, and Ecological Risk5–51
	5.2.6	Human H	Iealth         5–57
		5.2.6.1	Public Health
		5.2.6.2	Worker Health
	5.2.7	Environm	nental Justice
	5.2.8	Cultural I	Resources5–71
		5.2.8.1	Prehistoric Resources5–71
		5.2.8.2	Historic Resources
		5.2.8.3	Traditional Cultural Properties
	5.2.9	Socioeco	nomics, Infrastructure, and Waste Management5-74
		5.2.9.1	Socioeconomic Impacts
		5.2.9.2	Infrastructure Impacts5–77
		5.2.9.3	Waste Management
		5.2.9.4	Contaminated Space
	5.2.10	Transport	tation
		5.2.10.1	Vehicle-Related Risks
		5.2.10.2	Cargo-Related Risks
	5.2.11	Accident	Analysis
		5.2.11.1	Multiple Source Release of Hazardous Material from Site-Wide Earthquake and Wildfire
		5.2.11.2	Plutonium Releases from Manmade and Process Hazards at LANL
		5.2.11.3	Highly Enriched Uranium Release from Process Hazard Accident at LANL
		5.2.11.4	
		5.2.11.4	Tritium Release from a Manmade Hazard Accident
		3.2.11.3	Accidents at LANL
		5.2.11.6	Worker Accidents at LANL5–90
5.3	IMDAC	тс ое тие	EXPANDED OPERATIONS ALTERNATIVE5–100
5.5	5.3.1		ources
	3.3.1	5.3.1.1	Land Use Impacts
		5.3.1.2	Visual Impacts       5–100
		5.3.1.3	Noise
	5.3.2		and Soils
		•	
	5.3.3	water Ke	sources

	5.3.3.1	Surface Water	5-103
	5.3.3.2	Alluvial Groundwater	5–104
	5.3.3.3	Perched Groundwater	5–105
	5.3.3.4	Main Aquifer	5–105
	5.3.3.5	Area G	5–105
5.3.4	Air Qualit	у	5–107
	5.3.4.1	Nonradiological Air Quality Impacts	5–107
	5.3.4.2	Radiological Air Quality Impacts	5–108
	5.3.4.3	Project-Specific Siting and Construction Analyses	5–113
5.3.5	Ecological	l Resources, Biodiversity, and Ecological Risk	5–113
	5.3.5.1	Project-Specific Siting and Construction Analyses	5–113
5.3.6	Human He	ealth	
	5.3.6.1	Public Health	5–114
	5.3.6.2	Worker Health	5–117
5.3.7	Environme	ental Justice	5–120
5.3.8	Cultural R	desources	5–122
	5.3.8.1	Prehistoric Resources	
	5.3.8.2	Historic Resources	5–124
	5.3.8.3	Traditional Cultural Properties	
5.3.9	Socioecon	nomics, Infrastructure, and Waste Management	5–124
	5.3.9.1	Socioeconomic Impacts	
	5.3.9.2	Infrastructure Impacts	5–127
	5.3.9.3	Waste Management	5–128
	5.3.9.4	Contaminated Space	5–128
5.3.10	Transporta	ation	5–131
	5.3.10.1	Vehicle-Related Risks	5–131
	5.3.10.2	Cargo-Related Risks	5–131
5.3.11	Accident A	Analysis	5–136
	5.3.11.1	Multiple Source Release of Hazardous Material from	
		Site-Wide Earthquake and Wildfire	5–136
	5.3.11.2	Plutonium Releases from Manmade and Process Hazards at LANL	5 126
	5.3.11.3	Highly Enriched Uranium Release from Process	3–130
	3.3.11.3	Hazard Accident	5–139
	5.3.11.4	Tritium Release from a Manmade Hazard Accident	
		at LANL	5–139
	5.3.11.5	Chemical Releases from Manmade and Process Hazard	- ما د
		Accidents at LANL	
	5.3.11.6	Worker Accidents	5–139

5.4	IMPAC'	TS OF THE	REDUCED OPERATIONS ALTERNATIVE5–143
	5.4.1	Land Res	ources
		5.4.1.1	Land Use
		5.4.1.2	Visual Resources
		5.4.1.3	Noise
	5.4.2	Geology a	and Soils
	5.4.3	Water Re	sources
		5.4.3.1	Surface Water
		5.4.3.2	Alluvial Groundwater
		5.4.3.3	Perched Groundwater
		5.4.3.4	Main Aquifer
	5.4.4	Air Quali	ty5–145
		5.4.4.1	Nonradiological Air Quality Impacts
		5.4.4.2	Radiological Air Quality Impacts
	5.4.5	Ecologica	al Resources, Biodiversity, and Ecological Risk5–147
	5.4.6	Human H	ealth
		5.4.6.1	Public Health
		5.4.6.2	Worker Health
	5.4.7	Environm	nental Justice
	5.4.8	Cultural F	Resources5–155
	5.4.9	Socioecon	nomics, Infrastructure, and Waste Management5–155
		5.4.9.1	Socioeconomic Impacts
		5.4.9.2	Infrastructure Impacts
		5.4.9.3	Waste Management
		5.4.9.4	Contaminated Space
	5.4.10	Transport	ation
		5.4.10.1	Vehicle-Related Risks
		5.4.10.2	Cargo-Related Risks
	5.4.11	Accident	Analysis
		5.4.11.1	Multiple Source Release of Hazardous Material from Site-Wide Earthquake and Wildfire
		5.4.11.2	Plutonium Releases from Manmade and Process Hazards at LANL
		5.4.11.3	Highly Enriched Uranium Release from Process Hazard Accident
		5.4.11.4	Tritium Release from a Manmade Hazard Accident at LANL5–166
		5.4.11.5	Chemical Releases from Manmade and Process Hazard Accidents at LANL

		5.4.11.6	Worker Accidents	5–166		
5.5	IMPAC*	ACTS OF THE GREENER ALTERNATIVE				
	5.5.1	Land Res	ources	5–169		
		5.5.1.1	Land Use	5–169		
		5.5.1.2	Visual Resources	5–169		
		5.5.1.3	Noise	5–169		
	5.5.2	Geology a	and Soils	5–169		
	5.5.3	Water Re	sources	5–169		
		5.5.3.1	Surface Water	5–169		
		5.5.3.2	Alluvial Groundwater	5–169		
		5.5.3.3	Perched Groundwater	5–170		
		5.5.3.4	Main Aquifer	5–170		
	5.5.4	Air Quali	ty	5–171		
		5.5.4.1	Nonradiological Air Quality Impacts	5–171		
		5.5.4.2	Radiological Air Quality Impacts	5–172		
	5.5.5	Ecologica	al Resources, Biodiversity, and Ecological Risk	5–173		
	5.5.6	Human H	ealth	5–173		
		5.5.6.1	Public Health	5–173		
		5.5.6.2	Worker Health	5–177		
	5.5.7	Environm	nental Justice	5–179		
	5.5.8	Cultural F	Resources	5–181		
	5.5.9		nomics, Infrastructure, and Waste Management			
		5.5.9.1	Socioeconomic Impacts	5–181		
		5.5.9.2	Infrastructure Impacts	5–183		
		5.5.9.3	Waste Management			
		5.5.9.4	Contaminated Space	5–184		
	5.5.10	Transport	ation			
		5.5.10.1	Vehicle-Related Risks	5–184		
		5.5.10.2	Cargo-Related Risks	5–187		
	5.5.11	Accident	Analysis	5–190		
		5.5.11.1	Multiple Source Release of Hazardous Material from Site-Wide Earthquake and Wildfire			
		5.5.11.2	Plutonium Releases from Manmade and Process Hazards at LANL	5–190		
		5.5.11.3	Highly Enriched Uranium Release from Process Hazard Accident at LANL	5–192		
		5.5.11.4	Tritium Release from a Manmade Hazard			
		5.5.11.5	Chemical Releases from Manmade and Process Hazard Accidents at LANL	5–192		

		5.5.11.6	Worker Accidents at LANL	5–192
5.6	CUMU	LATIVE AN	D UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS	5–193
	5.6.1	Cumulativ	ve Impacts	5–193
		5.6.1.1	Land Use	5–193
		5.6.1.2	Water Resources	5–194
		5.6.1.3	Air Quality	5–194
		5.6.1.4	Ecological Resources	5–195
		5.6.1.5	Cultural Resources	5–196
		5.6.1.6	Socioeconomics	5–196
		5.6.1.7	Infrastructure	5–196
		5.6.1.8	Transportation	5–198
		5.6.1.9	Human Health	5–199
	5.6.2	Unavoida	ble Adverse Impacts	5–199
	5.6.3	Irreversib	le and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	5–199
	5.6.4		hip Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment faintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	5–200
REI	FERENCE	S		5–202
СНАР	TER 6.0	)		
MITIC	GATION	N MEASUI	RES	6–1
6.1	MITIG	SATION MEA	ASURES INCLUDED IN THE SWEIS ALTERNATIVES	6–1
	6.1.1	Existing I	Programs and Controls	6–1
	6.1.2	Specific N	Mitigation Measures Incorporated in the SWEIS Alternatives	6–4
6.2	Отне	r Mitigati	ON MEASURES CONSIDERED	6–5
KEI	FERENCE	S		6–/
	TER 7.( ICABLI		REGULATIONS, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS	7–1
7.0	INTRO	DUCTION.		7–1
7.1	DOE	REGULATO	RY AUTHORITIES FOR ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	7–2
	7.1.1		nergy Act of 1954	
		7.1.1.1	DOE Order 451.1A, National Environmental Policy Act	
			Compliance Program	7–3
		7.1.1.2	DOE Order 5400.1. General Environmental Protection Program	7–3

		7.1.1.3	DOE Order 5400.5, Radiation Protection of the Public and Environment	7–3
		7.1.1.4	DOE Order 5820.2A, Radioactive Waste Management	
7.2		,	TIONS AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS RELATED TO  L PLANNING AND CONSULTATION	7–4
	7.2.1		Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as Amended and re Order 11514, as Amended by Executive Order 11991	7–4
	7.2.2	Endange	red Species Act, as Amended, and Related Requirements	7–5
	7.2.3	National	Historic Preservation Act, as Amended	7–5
	7.2.4	National	Historic Preservation, Executive Order 11593	7–6
	7.2.5	America	n Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978	7–6
	7.2.6	Native A	American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990	7–6
	7.2.7	Archaeol	logical Resource Protection Act, as Amended	7–7
	7.2.8	Indian Sa	acred Sites, Executive Order 13007	7–7
	7.2.9	Pueblo A	Accords	7–7
	7.2.10		on of Wetlands, Executive Order 11990, and Floodplain ment, Executive Order 11988	7–8
	7.2.11	Environr	mental Justice, Executive Order 12898	7–8
	7.2.12	New Me	xico Environmental Oversight and Monitoring Agreement	7–8
	7.2.13	Recreati	ional Fisheries, Executive Order 12962	7–8
	7.2.14	Migrator	ry Bird Treaty Act	7–9
7.3			TIONS, AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS RELATED TO NVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND COMPLIANCE	7–9
7.4	AIR R	ESOURCES		7–10
	7.4.1	Clean Ai	ir Act, as Amended	7–10
	7.4.2	New Me	xico Air Quality Control Act	7–11
		7.4.2.1	Construction Permits	7–11
		7.4.2.2	Operating Permits	7–12
		7.4.2.3	Prevention of Significant Deterioration	7–12
		7.4.2.4	Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants	7–12
	7.4.3	Noise Co	ontrol Act of 1972	7–13
7.5	WATE	R RESOUR	CES	7–13
	7.5.1	Clean W	ater Act, as Amended	7–13
		7.5.1.1	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Program/Liquid Radioactive Discharges	7–14
		7.5.1.2	Unplanned Discharges, Spills, and Releases	7–15
		7.5.1.3	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan	7–16
		7.5.1.4	Sanitary Sewage Sludge Management Program	7–16

		7.5.1.5	Safe Drinking Water Act, as Amended	7–16
		7.5.1.6	Groundwater Protection Requirements	7–17
7.6			ES (WASTE MANAGEMENT, TOXIC SUBSTANCES, VENTION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION)	7–18
	7.6.1		e Conservation and Recovery Act	
	7.6.2	Radioact	tive Waste Management Requirements	7–20
	7.6.3	Federal F	Facility Compliance Act	7–21
	7.6.4	Undergro	ound Storage Tanks, RCRA Subtitle I	7–22
	7.6.5	-	hensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Act, as Amended	7–22
	7.6.6	Toxic Su	ubstances Control Act	7–23
	7.6.7	Hazardou	us Materials Transportation Act	7–24
	7.6.8	Federal I	Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act	7–24
	7.6.9	Pollution	n Prevention Act of 1990	7–25
7.7	Сомм	IUNITY RIC	GHT-TO-KNOW AND EMERGENCY PLANNING	7–25
	7.7.1	_	ncy Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act and re Order 12856	7–25
Арр	ENDIX 7	A Consi	ULTATIONS	7–27
KEF.	ERENCE	.5		1–29
CHAPT	_	DADEDC		0 1
LISI U	r PKE	PAKEKS	•••••	
CHAPT				
			ORGANIZATIONS, O WHOM COPIES OF	
			EEN SENT	9–1
CHAP				
				10–1
CHAPT CONTI			LOSURE STATEMENTS	11–1
OII A DO	DDD 10			
CHAPT INDEX				

OTHER PARTS OF THIS SWEIS (BOUND SEPARATELY FROM THIS VOLUME):		
SUMMARY		
VOLUME II PROJECT-SPECIFIC SITING AND CO	- ONSTRUCTION ANALYSES	
VOLUME III APPENDIXES (2 PARTS)	- -	
VOLUME IV COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT	<u>-</u>	

# VOLUME I LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1–1	Location of the Los Alamos National Laboratory1–2
FIGURE 2.1.2.2–1	Gross Space Utilization by Function2–7
FIGURE 2.1.2.5–1	Geographic Locations of the Operable Units
Figure 2.2.1–1	Technical Areas of Los Alamos National Laboratory2–19
Figure 2.2.2–1	Key Facility Locations Within LANL
FIGURE 2.2.2.1–1	TA-55 Plutonium Facility Complex
Figure 2.2.2.2–1	TA-16 Tritium Facilities (WETF)2-34
Figure 2.2.2.2–2	TA-21 Tritium Facilities (TSTA and TSFF)2-35
FIGURE 2.2.2.3–1	TA-3 Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building
Figure 2.2.2.4–1	TA-18 Pajarito Site
Figure 2.2.2.5–1	The Sigma Complex in TA-3
Figure 2.2.2.6–1	Materials Science Laboratory
Figure 2.2.2.7–1	Target Fabrication Facility2–57
FIGURE 2.2.2.8–1	Main Machine Shops
Figure 2.2.2.9–1	TA-8 High Explosives Processing
FIGURE 2.2.2.9–2	TA-9 High Explosives Processing
FIGURE 2.2.2.9–3	TA-11 High Explosives Processing
FIGURE 2.2.2.9–4	TA-16 High Explosives Processing
FIGURE 2.2.2.9–5	TA–16 West High Explosives Processing
Figure 2.2.2.9–6	TA-16 East High Explosives Processing
Figure 2.2.2.9–7	TA–28 High Explosives Processing

FIGURE 2.2.2.9–8	TA-37 High Explosives Processing
FIGURE 2.2.2.9–9	TA-22 Los Alamos Detonator Facility
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–1	TA-14 High Explosives Testing
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–2	TA-15 West High Explosives Testing
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–3	TA-15 Central High Explosives Testing2-76
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–4	TA-15 East and TA-36 West High Explosives Testing
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–5	TA-36 East High Explosives Testing
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–6	TA-39 High Explosives Testing
FIGURE 2.2.2.10–7	TA-40 East High Explosives Testing
FIGURE 2.2.2.11–1	TA-53 Los Alamos Neutron Science Center
FIGURE 2.2.2.11–2	TA-53 Los Alamos Neutron Science Center West
FIGURE 2.2.2.11–3	TA-53 Los Alamos Neutron Science Center East
FIGURE 2.2.2.12–1	TA-43 Health Research Laboratory
FIGURE 2.2.2.13–1	TA–48 Radiochemistry Facility2–96
FIGURE 2.2.2.14–1	TA-50 Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility2-100
FIGURE 2.2.2.15–1	TA-50 Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities2-104
FIGURE 2.2.2.15–2	TA-54 Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities2-105
FIGURE 2.2.2.15–3	TA-54 Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities2-106
FIGURE 2.2.2.15–4	TA-54 Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities
FIGURE 2.2.2.15–5	TA–54 Area G Disposal Cells
FIGURE 4.0–1	Location of LANL
FIGURE 4.1.1–1	Land Stewardship in the LANL Area
FIGURE 4.1.1.2–1	Land Use Within LANL Boundaries4–8
FIGURE 4.1.1.5–1	Santa Fe National Forest Management Areas

FIGURE 4.2–1	Geology of the LANL Region4–23
FIGURE 4.2.1–1	Stratigraphic Units and Structure of the LANL Area
FIGURE 4.2.2.2–1	Major Surface Faults at LANL
FIGURE 4.2.3.1–1	On-Site and Off-Site Perimeter Soil Sampling Locations
FIGURE 4.2.3.1–2	Regional Soil Sampling Locations
FIGURE 4.3–1	Conceptual Sketch of Groundwater Flow Paths in the Española Portion of the Northern Rio Grande Basin
FIGURE 4.3–2	Conceptual Geohydrological Drawing of the Pajarito Plateau
FIGURE 4.3.1–1	Watersheds in the LANL Region4–48
FIGURE 4.3.1.1–1	Regional Surface Water and Sediment Sampling Locations4–49
FIGURE 4.3.1.1–2	On-Site and Perimeter Surface Water Sampling Locations4–50
FIGURE 4.3.1.3–1	Stream Reaches and NPDES Outfall Locations
FIGURE 4.3.1.4–1	On-Site and Off-Site Perimeter Sediment Sampling Locations 4–64
FIGURE 4.3.1.4–2	Plutonium Concentrations and Likely Sources
FIGURE 4.3.1.5–1	Tritium and Plutonium Activity at Mortandad Canyon at Gaging Station 1.a
FIGURE 4.3.2–1	Springs in the LANL Area4–71
FIGURE 4.3.2.1–1	Observation Wells and Springs Used for Alluvial and Intermediate Groundwater Sampling
FIGURE 4.3.2.1–2	Regional Aquifer Test Wells, Supply Wells, Springs, and Water Level Contours
FIGURE 4.3.2.4–1	Approximate Aquifer Water Level Decline from 1949–1950 to 1993 4–80
FIGURE 4.4.1–1	LANL Meteorological Stations
FIGURE 4.4.1–2	Mean High and Low Temperatures for Los Alamos (1961 to 1990) and White Rock (1965 to 1990)
FIGURE 4.4.1–3	Mean Precipitation for Los Alamos (1961 to 1990) and White Rock (1965 to 1990)

FIGURE 4.4.1.1–1	LANL Meteorological Stations with Associated Wind Rose Data 4–87
FIGURE 4.5.1.1–1	LANL Technical Areas and Watersheds4–97
FIGURE 4.5.1.1–2	LANL Technical Areas and Watersheds with Vegetation Zones 4–99
FIGURE 4.5.1.2–1	LANL Technical Areas and Watersheds with Wetland Locations 4–108
FIGURE 4.6.1.1–1	Total Contributions to 1996 Dose for LANL's Maximally Exposed Individual
FIGURE 4.6.1.1–2	LANL's Contribution to Dose by Pathway for LANL's Maximally Exposed Individual
FIGURE 4.7.1–1	Sectors Used for Environmental Justice Analysis Within 50 Miles (80 Kilometers) of LANL
FIGURE 4.7.1–2	Sectors with Minority and Low-Income Populations Greater Than 25 Percent of the Sector Population
FIGURE 4.8–1	Pueblos and Reservations in the LANL Region
Figure 4.9.1.6–1	University of California Procurement in New Mexico Counties, Fiscal Year 1995
FIGURE 4.9.2.1–1	Los Alamos Area Natural Gas Distribution System
FIGURE 4.9.2.1–2	Los Alamos Area Electrical Power Distribution System
FIGURE 4.9.2.1–3	Los Alamos Area Water Distribution System
FIGURE 4.10.1–1	Regional Transportation Map
Figure 5.1.10–1	Transportation Risk Analysis Methodology
FIGURE 5.2.4.2–1	Isodose Map Showing Doses Greater Than 1 Millirem per Year for the No Action Alternative
FIGURE 5.2.4.2–2	Isodose Map Showing Doses Less Than 1 Millirem per Year for the No Action Alternative
FIGURE 5.2.7–1	Isodose Lines from Airborne Releases for the No Action Alternative Within 50 Miles (80 Kilometers) of LANL
FIGURE 5.3.4.2–1	Isodose Map Showing Doses Greater Than 1 Millirem per Year for the Expanded Operations Alternative

FIGURE 5.3.4.2–2	Isodose Map Showing Doses Less Than 1 Millirem per Year for the Expanded Operations Alternative
FIGURE 5.3.7–1	Isodose Lines from Airborne Releases for the Expanded Operations Alternative Within 50 Miles (80 Kilometers) of LANL
FIGURE 5.4.4.2–1	Isodose Map Showing Doses Greater Than 1 Millirem per Year for the Reduced Operations Alternative
FIGURE 5.4.4.2–2	Isodose Map Showing Doses Less Than 1 Millirem per Year for the Reduced Operations Alternative
Figure 5.4.7–1	Isodose Lines from Airborne Releases for the Reduced Operations Alternative Within 50 Miles (80 Kilometers) of LANL 5–154
FIGURE 5.5.4.2–1	Isodose Map Showing Doses Greater Than 1 Millirem per Year for the Greener Alternative
FIGURE 5.5.4.2–2	Isodose Map Showing Doses Less Than 1 Millirem per Year for the Greener Alternative
Figure 5.5.7–1	Isodose Lines from Airborne Releases for the Greener Alternative Within 50 Miles (80 Kilometers) of LANL
Figure 7.5.1.1–1	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Exceedances7–15
FIGURE 7.5.1.1–2	Liquid Release Notifications

## VOLUME I LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.1.5–1	Primary Laboratory Performers for DOE Missions
TABLE 2.1.2.5–1	Summary of Environmental Restoration Project Field Units, Technical Areas, Operable Units, Potential Contaminants, and Waste Types Generated During Characterization/Remediation
TABLE 2.1.2.5–2	Major Decommissioning Activities Completed to Date at LANL 2–13
TABLE 2.1.2.5–3	Future Decommissioning Activities at LANL
TABLE 2.2–1	Number of Nuclear and Moderate/Low Hazard Facilities at LANL by Technical Area
TABLE 2.2.1–1	Overview of Technical Areas and Their Associated Activities2–20
TABLE 2.2.2–1	Identification of Key Facilities for Analysis of LANL Operations 2–24
TABLE 2.2.2.1–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Plutonium Facility Complex (TA–55)
TABLE 2.2.2.2–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Tritium Facilities
TABLE 2.2.2.3–1	Principal Buildings and Structures in the Chemical and Metallurgy Research Building
TABLE 2.2.2.3–2	CMR Building Upgrades Project Crosswalk Between Phases I and II and 1998 Scope of Work Authorized or Under Review
TABLE 2.2.2.4–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Pajarito Site
TABLE 2.2.2.5–1	Principal Structures and Buildings in the Sigma Complex2–50
TABLE 2.2.2.6–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of Materials Science Laboratory 2–53
TABLE 2.2.2.7–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of Target Fabrication Facility 2–56
TABLE 2.2.2.8–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of Main Machine Shops 2–58
TABLE 2.2.2.9–1	High Explosives Processing Facilities: Identification of Principal Buildings/Structures
TABLE 2.2.2.10-1	Principal Buildings and Structures of High Explosives Testing Facilities

TABLE 2.2.2.11–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of Los Alamos Neutron Science Center
TABLE 2.2.2.12–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Health Research Laboratory
TABLE 2.2.2.13–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Radiochemistry Facility 2–95
TABLE 2.2.2.14–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility
TABLE 2.2.2.15–1	Principal Buildings and Structures of the Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities
TABLE 2.4–1	LANL Consolidated Funding Summary (Fiscal Year 1994 to Fiscal Year 1998)
TABLE 3.6.1–1	Alternatives for Continued Operation of TA–55 Plutonium Facility Complex
TABLE 3.6.1–2	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Plutonium Facility Complex (TA–55)
TABLE 3.6.1–3	Alternatives for Continued Operation of Tritium Facilities
TABLE 3.6.1–4	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Tritium Facilities (TA–16 and TA–21)
TABLE 3.6.1–5	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building (TA–3)
TABLE 3.6.1–6	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building (TA–3)3–82
TABLE 3.6.1–7	Alternatives for Continued Operations of Pajarito Site (TA-18)3-83
TABLE 3.6.1–8	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Pajarito Site, (TA–18)
TABLE 3.6.1–9	Alternatives for Continued Operation of Sigma Complex
TABLE 3.6.1–10	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Sigma Complex (TA–3)
TABLE 3.6.1–11	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Materials Science Laboratory (TA–3–1698)

TABLE 3.6.1–12	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Material Science Laboratory (TA–3)
TABLE 3.6.1–13	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Target Fabrication Facility (TA–35)
TABLE 3.6.1–14	Parameter Differences Among Alteratives for Continued Operation of the Target Fabrication Facility (TA–35)
TABLE 3.6.1–15	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Machine Shops, TA-3 3–93
TABLE 3.6.1–16	Parameter Differences Among Alteratives for Continued Operation of the Machine Shops (TA–3)
TABLE 3.6.1–17	Alternatives for the Continued Operation of the High Explosives Processing Facilities (TA-8, TA-9, TA-11, TA-16, TA-22, TA-29, and TA-37)
TABLE 3.6.1–18	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of High Explosives Processing (TA–8, TA–9, TA–11, TA–16, TA–22, TA–28, and TA–37)
TABLE 3.6.1–19	Alternatives for the Continued Operation of High Explosives Testing: TA-14 (Q-Site), TA-15 (R-Site), TA-36 (Kappa-Site), TA-39 (Ancho Canyon Site), and TA-40 (DF-Site)
TABLE 3.6.1–20	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of High Explosives Testing, TA–14 (Q-Site) TA–15 (R-Site) TA–36 (Kappa Site), and TA–40 (DF-Site)
TABLE 3.6.1–21	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center (TA–53)
TABLE 3.6.1–22	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center (TA–53) 3–107
TABLE 3.6.1–23	Alternatives for the Continued Operation of the Health Research Laboratory (TA–43)
TABLE 3.6.1–24	Parameter Differences in Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Health Research Laboratory (TA–43)
TABLE 3.6.1–25	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Radiochemistry Facility (TA–48)
TABLE 3.6.1–26	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Radiochemistry Site TA–48)

TABLE 3.6.1–27	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (TA–50)	3–117
TABLE 3.6.1–28	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operations of the Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (TA–50)	3–119
TABLE 3.6.1–29	Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities (TA–54 and TA–50)	3–120
TABLE 3.6.1–30	Parameter Differences Among Alternatives for Continued Operation of the Solid Radioactive and Chemical Waste Facilities (TA–54 and TA–50)	3–124
TABLE 3.6.1–31	Parameters for LANL Activities Other Than Those at the Key Facilities	3–125
TABLE 3.6.2–1	Comparison of Potential Consequences of Continued Operations of LANL: Normal Operations	3–126
TABLE 3.6.2–2	Comparison of Potential Consequences of Continued Operations of LANL: Accidents	3–136
TABLE 4.1.1.1–1	Land Stewards Within Los Alamos County	4–4
TABLE 4.1.1.2–1	LANL General Land Use	4–9
TABLE 4.1.1.3-1	Los Alamos County (Excluding LANL) Land Use Definitions	4–9
TABLE 4.1.1.5–1	Santa Fe National Forest Management Areas	4–12
TABLE 4.1.3.1–1	Limiting Values for Average Daily Noise Exposure	4–18
TABLE 4.1.3.1–2	Occupational Exposure Limits for Impulse/Impact Noise	4–19
TABLE 4.2.1–1	Characteristics of the Major Stratigraphic Units in the LANL Region	4–24
TABLE 4.2.2.2–1	Summary of Major Faults	4–29
TABLE 4.2.2.2–2	Summary of Ongoing Geologic Field Studies	4–30
TABLE 4.2.2.2–3	Correlations Among Observed Effects of Earthquakes, Richter Magnitudes, and Peak Ground Acceleration	4–32
TABLE 4.2.2.2–4	Peak Horizontal Ground Accelerations Corresponding to Return Periods from 500 to 10,000 Years for Eight LANL Technical Areas	4–33

TABLE 4.2.3.1–1	Regional Statistical Reference Level and LANL Screening Action Levels for Radionuclides
TABLE 4.3–1	Summary of Water Resources and Sampling Locations by Watershed 4–46
TABLE 4.3.1.1–1	Summary of Discharges from Stream Monitoring Stations at LANL, Water Year 1995 (October 1, 1994 Through September 30, 1995)
TABLE 4.3.1.3–1	NPDES Outfalls by Watershed
TABLE 4.3.1.3–2	LANL NPDES Discharge Limits (Daily Average/Daily Maximum) 4–60
TABLE 4.3.1.3–3	Number of NPDES Violations (1991 Through 1995)
TABLE 4.4.2.2–1	Combustion Sources at LANL
TABLE 4.4.2.3–1	Nonradiological Ambient Air Monitoring Results at TA–49 (1991 Through 1994)
TABLE 4.4.3.3–1	Dose to the MEI from Exposure to LANL Airborne Radionuclide Emissions (1990 Through 1995)
TABLE 4.4.4–1	Average Visibility Measurements at Bandelier National Monument (1991 to 1994)
TABLE 4.5.1.1–1	Regional Watershed Summary
TABLE 4.5.1.1–2	Areal Extent of Major Vegetation Zones by Watershed4–100
TABLE 4.5.1.1–3	Characteristics of the Major Vegetation Zones in the LANL Area 4–102
TABLE 4.5.1.1–4	Vegetation Zones—Disturbances and Current Ecological Conditions 4–104
TABLE 4.5.1.2–1	Regional Watersheds and Wetlands in Association with Los Alamos National Laboratory Outfalls
TABLE 4.5.1.2–2	Wetlands—Disturbance and Current Ecological Conditions 4–110
TABLE 4.5.1.3–1	Canyons—Disturbance and Current Ecological Conditions
TABLE 4.5.1.4–1	Rio Grande Disturbance and Current Ecological Conditions 4–112
TABLE 4.5.1.5–1	Protected and Sensitive Species
TABLE 4.6.1.1–1	Total Effective Dose Equivalent (millirem/year) from Natural or Manmade Sources

TABLE 4.6.1.1–2	Estimated Dose to Maximally Exposed Members of the Public from LANL Operations for 1996	131
TABLE 4.6.1.3–1	All Cancer: All Races, Both Sexes, Age-Adjusted Incidence Rates (1983 Through 1987 and 1988 Through 1991) 4–1	135
TABLE 4.6.2.1–1	Representative Examples of Recorded Radiological and Chemical Exposures and Physical Accidents Affecting Workers at LANL 1993 Through 1996	139
TABLE 4.6.2.1–2	Total Recordable and Lost Workday Cases Rates at LANL and at Other DOE Facilities (1990 Through 1995)	41
TABLE 4.6.2.2–1	Baseline Radiological Exposure to LANL Workers	43
TABLE 4.7.1–1	Environmental Justice Areas Within a 50-Mile (80-Kilometer) Radius of LANL	154
TABLE 4.8.1–1	Archaeological Periods of Northern New Mexico4–1	159
TABLE 4.8.1–2	Prehistoric Site Types and Number of Sites Recorded in the LANL Cultural Resources Database	l <b>6</b> 0
TABLE 4.8.2–1	Historic Site Types and Number of Sites Recorded in the LANL Cultural Resources Database	61
TABLE 4.8.3–1	Traditional Cultural Properties Identified by Consulting Communities on or near LANL Property4–1	163
TABLE 4.9.1.1–1	1990 Population by Race and Ethnicity for the Tri-County Region 4–1	65
TABLE 4.9.1.1–2	Tri-County Population Projections Through the Year 2006 4–1	65
TABLE 4.9.1.2–1	Income Data for the LANL Region	65
TABLE 4.9.1.3–1	Regional Civilian Labor Force, Employment, Unemployment, and Unemployment Rates (1995)	166
TABLE 4.9.1.4–1	Earnings for Tri-County Region (Thousands of Dollars)4–1	67
TABLE 4.9.1.5–1	Employees of the LANL-Affiliated Work Force by County of Residence (March 1996)	168
TABLE 4.9.1.5–2	LANL-Affiliated Work Force by Race and Ethnicity	68
TABLE 4.9.1.5–3	Percentage of University of California Employees by  Race/Ethnicity (March 1996)  4–1	169

TABLE 4.9.1.5–4	Salary and Work Force Shares of University of California Employees by Race/Ethnicity (1986)
TABLE 4.9.1.6–1	University of California Procurement for Fiscal Years 1993 Through 1995
TABLE 4.9.1.8–1	Municipal and County General Fund Revenues in the Tri-County Region (Fiscal Year 1995)
TABLE 4.9.1.8–2	Municipal General Fund Revenues in Tri-County Region (Fiscal Year 1995)
TABLE 4.9.1.8–3	Rio Arriba and Santa Fe Counties Revenues (Fiscal Year 1995) 4–174
TABLE 4.9.1.8–4	DOE Payments to Los Alamos County (Fiscal Year 1997)4–175
TABLE 4.9.1.8–5	Public School Statistics in the LANL Region (1995–1996 School Year)
TABLE 4.9.1.8–6	Regional Housing Summary for the Tri-County Region (1990) 4–177
TABLE 4.9.2.1–1	Gas Consumption (Decatherms) at LANL (Fiscal Years 1991 to 1995)
TABLE 4.9.2.1–2	Electric Peak Coincidental Demand (Kilowatt) (Fiscal Years 1991 to 1995)
TABLE 4.9.2.1–3	Electric Consumption (Megawatthour) (Fiscal Years 1991 to 1995) 4–183
TABLE 4.9.3.3–1	Historical Waste Generation Ranges and Annual Baseline Generation Rates at LANL (1990 Through 1995)
TABLE 4.9.4–1	Estimated Existing Contaminated Space in LANL Facilities 4–193
TABLE 4.10.1–1	Traffic for Selected Highway Segments in the Vicinity of LANL 4–198
TABLE 4.10.2–1	Accidents Within Los Alamos County (1990 Through 1994) 4–199
TABLE 4.10.2–2	Truck Accident Rates in the Santa Fe to Los Alamos Area (1990 Through 1994)
TABLE 4.10.3.1–1	Annual LANL On-Site and Off-Site Shipments
TABLE 4.10.3.2–1	Summary of Off-Site, Unclassified Radioactive and Hazardous Materials Shipments (1990 Through 1994)
TABLE 5.1.4.1–1	Guideline Values Applied in the Nonradiological Air Quality Analysis 5–7

TABLE 5.1.4.2–1	Facilities Modeled for Radionuclide Air Emissions
TABLE 5.1.11.1–1	SWEIS Accident Analysis Facility Listing
TABLE 5.1.11.7–1	Dominant Accidents at LANL
TABLE 5.1.11.7–2	Incredible Accidents That Were Analyzed5–32
TABLE 5.1.11.9–1	Dominant Worker Accidents at LANL
TABLE 5.2.3.1–1	NPDES Discharges by Watershed Under the No Action Alternative 5–42
TABLE 5.2.3.1–2	TA-50 Radionuclide Summary
TABLE 5.2.3.1–3	Maximum Water Level Changes at the Top of the Main Aquifer Under the No Action Alternative (1997 Through 2006)5–48
TABLE 5.2.4.2–1	Facility-Specific Maximally Exposed Individual Information—No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.6.1–1	Estimated Public Health Consequences for LANL Maximally Exposed Individual and the Population Within 50-Mile (80-Kilometer) Radius of LANL for the No Action Alternative 5–58
TABLE 5.2.6.1–2	Average Public Radiological Dose and Potential Consequences by Ingestion Pathways, All Alternatives
TABLE 5.2.6.1–3	Worst-Case Public Radiological Dose and Potential Consequences by Ingestion Pathways, All Alternatives
Table 5.2.6.1–4	Metals Exposure and Risk via Ingestion Pathways and Hypothetical Receptors Used to Evaluate Potential Public Health Consequence, All Alternatives
TABLE 5.2.6.1–5	Radiation Doses and Excess LCF Risks Estimated to the Public at Stops During Transportation of Materials from LANL 5–67
TABLE 5.2.6.2–1	Worker Ionizing Radiation Annual Doses and Associated Lifetime Excess LCF Risks Under the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.6.2–2	Projected Annual Reportable Worker Accidents and Injuries for Normal Operations in the No Action Alternative Compared with the Index Period
TABLE 5.2.8–1	Projected Impacts to Prehistoric Resources, Historic Resources, and TCPs Under the No Action Alternative

Table 5.2.9.1–1	Summary of Primary LANL Employment, Salaries, and Procurement Under the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.9.1–2	Summary of Total Tri-County Employment, Salaries, Business Activity, and Population Changes Under the No Action Alternative5–76
TABLE 5.2.9.1–3	Construction Spending, Labor Salaries, and Labor Employment Numbers Under the No Action Alternative (Fiscal Year 1997 Through 2006)
TABLE 5.2.9.3–1	Projected Annual and 10-Year Total Waste Generation Under the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.10.1–1	Truck Accident Injuries and Fatalities Projected for LANL Shipments Under the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.10.2–1	Incident-Free Population Dose and Lifetime Excess LCFs for Off-Site Shipments per Year of Operation Under the No Action Alternative 5–81
TABLE 5.2.10.2–2	MEI Doses and Associated Frequencies for Off-Site Radioactive Materials Accidents
TABLE 5.2.10.2–3	Bounding Radioactive Materials Off-Site Accident Population Risk for the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.10.2–4	MEI Doses and Frequencies for Bounding On-Site Radioactive Materials Accidents Under the No Action Alternative5–83
TABLE 5.2.10.2–5	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Chlorine Accident Under the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.10.2–6	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Propane Accident Under the No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.11.1–1	Summary of Radiological Risks from Earthquake-Initiated and Wildfire Accident Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative 5–87
TABLE 5.2.11.1–2	Summary of Chemical Exposure Risks from Site-Wide Accident Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.11.2–1	Summary of Radiological Consequences for Plutonium Release Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative

TABLE 5.2.11.3–1	Summary of Radiological Consequences from Highly Enriched Uranium Release Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.11.4–1	Summary of Radiological Consequences from Tritium Release Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.11.5–1	Summary of Chlorine Exposure Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.11.5–2	Summary of Chemical Exposure Scenarios—No Action Alternative 5–96
TABLE 5.2.11.6–1	Summary of Worker Accident Scenarios at LANL—No Action Alternative
TABLE 5.2.11.6–2	Summary of Consequences to Workers at Origination Facilities for Accident Scenarios
TABLE 5.3.3.1–1	NPDES Discharges by Watershed Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.3.4–1	Maximum Water Level Changes at the Top of the Main Aquifer Under the Expanded Operations Alternative (1997 Through 2006) 5–106
TABLE 5.3.4.1–1	Results of Criteria Pollutants Analysis (Expanded Operations Alternative)
TABLE 5.3.4.2–1	Facility-Specific Information—Expanded Operations Alternative 5–109
TABLE 5.3.6.1–1	Estimated Public Health Consequences for LANL MEI and the Population Within a 50-Mile (80-Kilometer) Radius of LANL for the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.6.1–2	Radiation Doses and Excess LCF Risks Estimated to the Public at Stops During Transportation of Materials and Wastes from LANL Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.6.2–1	Annual Worker Doses and Associated Lifetime Excess LCF Risks Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.6.2–2	Projected Annual Reportable Accidents and Injuries for the Expanded Operations Alternative Compared with the Index Period
TABLE 5.3.8–1	Projected Impacts to Prehistoric Resources, Historic Resources, and Traditional Cultural Properties Under the Expanded Operations

TABLE 5.3.9.1–1	Summary of Primary LANL Employment, Salaries, and Procurement Under the Expanded Operations Alternative5–125
TABLE 5.3.9.1–2	Summary of Total Tri-County Employment, Salaries, Business Activity, and Population Changes Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.9.1–3	Construction Spending, Labor Salaries, and Labor Employment Numbers Under the Expanded Operations Alternative (Fiscal Year 1997 Through 2006)
TABLE 5.3.9.3–1	Projected Annual and 10-Year Total Waste Generation Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.10.1–1	Truck Accident Injuries and Fatalities Projected for LANL Shipments Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.10.2–1	Incident-Free Population Dose and Lifetime Excess LCFs for Off-Site Shipments per Year of Operation Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.10.2–2	Bounding Radioactive Materials Off-Site Accident Population Risk for the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.10.2–3	MEI Doses and Frequencies for Bounding On-Site Radioactive Materials Accidents Under the Expanded Operations Alternative 5–134
TABLE 5.3.10.2–4	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Chlorine Accident Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.10.2–5	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Propane Accident Under the Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.11.2–1	Summary of Radiological Consequences for Plutonium Release Scenarios at LANL—Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.11.3–1	Summary of Radiological Consequences from Highly Enriched Uranium Release Scenarios at LANL—Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.11.5–1	Summary of Chlorine Exposure Scenarios at LANL—Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.3.11.5–2	Summary of Chemical Exposure Scenarios—Expanded Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.3.1–1	NPDES Discharges by Watershed Under the Reduced Operations Alternative

TABLE 5.4.3.4–1	Maximum Water Level Changes at the Top of the Main Aquifer Under the Reduced Operations Alternative (1997 Through 2006) 5–145
TABLE 5.4.4.2–1	Facility-Specific Information Reduced Operations Alternative 5–146
TABLE 5.4.6.1–1	Estimated Public Health Consequences for LANL MEI and the Population Within a 50-Mile (80-Kilometer) Radius of LANL for the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.6.1–2	Radiation Doses and Excess LCF Risks Estimated to the Public at Stops During Transportation of Materials and Wastes from LANL 5–151
TABLE 5.4.6.2–1	Annual Worker Doses and Associated Lifetime Excess LCF Risks Under the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.6.2–2	Projected Annual Reportable Accidents and Injuries for the Reduced Operations Alternative Compared with the Index Period5–153
TABLE 5.4.9.1–1	Summary of Primary LANL Employment, Salaries, and Procurement Under the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.9.1–2	Summary of Total Tri-County Employment, Salaries, Business Activity, and Population Changes Under the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.9.1–3	Construction Spending, Labor Salaries, and Labor Employment Numbers Under the Reduced Operations Alternative (Fiscal Year 1997 Through 2006)
TABLE 5.4.9.3–1	Projected Annual and 10-Year Total Waste Generation Under the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.10.1–1	Truck Accident Injuries and Fatalities Projected for LANL Shipments Under the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.10.2–1	Incident-Free Population Dose and Lifetime Excess LCFs for Off-Site Shipments per Year of Operation Under the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.10.2–2	Bounding Radioactive Materials Off-Site Accident Population Risk for the Reduced Operations Alternative
TABLE 5.4.10.2–3	MEI Doses and Frequencies for Bounding On-Site Radioactive Materials Accidents Under the Reduced Operations Alternative 5–163
TABLE 5.4.10.2–4	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Chlorine Accident Under the Reduced Operations Alternative 5–165

Table 5.4.10.2–5	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Propane Accident Under the Reduced Operations Alternative5–10	65
TABLE 5.4.11.5–1	Summary of Chlorine Exposure Scenarios at LANL—Reduced Operations Alternative	67
TABLE 5.4.11.5–2	Summary of Chemical Exposure Scenarios—Reduced Operations Alternative	68
TABLE 5.5.3.1–1	NPDES Discharges by Watershed Under the Greener Alternative 5–17	70
TABLE 5.5.3.4–1	Maximum Water Level Changes at the Top of the Main Aquifer Under the Greener Alternative (1997 Through 2006)	71
TABLE 5.5.4.2–1	Facility-Specific Information—Greener Alternative	72
TABLE 5.5.6.1–1	Estimated Public Health Consequences for LANL MEI and the Population Within 50-Mile (80-Kilometer) Radius of LANL for the Greener Alternative	7 <i>6</i>
TABLE 5.5.6.1–2	Radiation Doses and Excess LCF Risks Estimated to the Public at Stops During Transportation of Materials and Wastes from LANL 5–17	77
TABLE 5.5.6.2–1	Annual Worker Doses and Associated Lifetime Excess LCF Risks Under the Greener Alternative	77
TABLE 5.5.6.2–2	Projected Reportable Annual Accidents and Injuries for the Greener Alternative Compared with the Index Period	<b>7</b> 9
TABLE 5.5.9.1–1	Summary of Primary LANL Employment, Salaries, and Procurement Under the Greener Alternative	82
TABLE 5.5.9.1–2	Summary of Total Tri-County Employment, Salaries, Business Activity, and Population Changes Under the Greener Alternative 5–18	82
TABLE 5.5.9.1–3	Construction Spending, Labor Salaries, and Labor Employment Numbers Under the Greener Alternative (Fiscal Year 1997 Through 2006)	83
TABLE 5.5.9.3–1	Projected Annual and 10-Year Total Waste Generation Under the Greener Alternative	85
TABLE 5.5.10.1–1	Truck Accident Injuries and Fatalities Projected for LANL Shipments Under the Greener Alternative	88

TABLE 5.5.10.2–1	Incident-Free Population Dose and Lifetime Excess LCFs for Off-Site Shipments per Year of Operation Under the Greener Alternative
TABLE 5.5.10.2–2	Bounding Radioactive Materials Off-Site Accident Population Risk for the Greener Alternative
TABLE 5.5.10.2–3	MEI Doses and Frequencies for Bounding On-Site Radioactive Materials Accidents Under the Greener Alternative
TABLE 5.5.10.2–4	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Chlorine Accident Under the Greener Alternative
Table 5.5.10.2–5	Frequencies, Consequences, and Risk for a Major Propane Accident Under the Greener Alternative

## VOLUME I ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACGIH American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists

ACIS Automated Chemical Inventory System

ACL administrative control level

ACM asbestos-containing material

ADTT accelerator-driven transmutation technology

AEA Atomic Energy Act

AEC U.S. Atomic Energy Commission

AIP Agreement in Principle

AIRNET ambient air monitoring program

ALARA as low as reasonably achievable

ALOHA<sup>TM</sup> Areal Locations of Hazardous Atmospheres (computer model)

ANSI American National Standards Institute

AO Administrative Order

APT accelerator production of tritium

BAT best available technology

BIA Bureau of Indian Affairs

BIO Basis for Interim Operation

BLM Bureau of Land Management

BMP best management practice

BNM Bandelier National Monument

BOD biochemical/biological oxygen demand

BTC Beryllium Technology Center

°C degrees Celsius

CA composite analysis

CAA Clean Air Act

CAD computer-aided design

CAM continuous air monitor

CAMP Capital Assets Management Process

CAP–88 Clean Air Act Assessment Package for 1988

CBD chronic beryllium disease

CCNS Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety

CDE committed dose equivalent

CDP Census Designated Place

CDR Conceptual Design Report

CEDE committed effective dose equivalent

CEQ Council on Environmental Quality

CERCLA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

CH contact-handled (waste)

CH TRU contact-handled transuranic (waste)

Ci curie

cm centimeter

CMIP Capability Maintenance and Improvement Project

CMR Chemistry and Metallurgy Research

COD chemical oxygen demand

CRMT Cultural Resources Management Team

CT Conveyance and Transfer (EIS)

CTBT Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

CVD chemical vapor deposition

CVI chemical vapor infiltration

CY calendar year

D&D decontamination and decommissioning

DARHT Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test (Facility)

dB decibel

dBA decibels A-weighted frequency scale

DCG derived concentration guide

DEGADIS dense gas dispersion (computer model)

DNFSB Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

DEL Dynamic Experiment Laboratory

DNA deoxyribonucleic acid

DoD U.S. Department of Defense

DOE U.S. Department of Energy

DOI U.S. Department of the Interior

DOP detailed operating procedure

DOT U.S. Department of Transportation

DU depleted uranium

EA environmental assessment

EDE effective dose equivalent

EIS environmental impact statement

EM DOE Office of Environmental Management

EM&R emergency management and response

EPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

EPCRA Emergency Planning and Community-Right-to-Know Act

ER environmental restoration

ERPG Emergency Response Planning Guideline

ES&H Environmental, Safety and Health (division of LANL)

°F degrees Fahrenheit

FAA Federal Aviation Administration

FIFRA Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

FONSI Finding of No Significant Impact

FR Federal Register

FS MEI facility-specific maximally exposed individual

ft feet

FTE full-time equivalent (employees)

FU field unit

FWS U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

FY fiscal year

g gram

GV guideline value

GWPMPP Groundwater Protection Management Program Plan

ha hectares

HA hazard analysis

HAP hazardous air pollutant

HE high explosives

HEFS High Explosives Firing Site

HELWTF High Explosives Liquid Wastewater Treatment Facility

HEPA high-efficiency particulate air (filter)

HEPP High Explosives Pulsed Power

HEU highly enriched uranium

HEWTF High Explosives Wastewater Treatment Facility

HI hazard index

HLW high-level waste

HRL Health Research Laboratory

HSWA Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984

HT tritium gas

HTO tritiated water

HVAC heating, ventilation, and air conditioning

HW hazardous waste

IATA International Air Traffic Association

ICF inertial confinement fusion

ICRP International Commission on Radiological Protection

IH industrial hygiene

in. inch

IPF Isotope Production Facility

IR infrared

IRIS Integrated Risk Information System

ISC-3 Industrial Source Complex (Model) Version 3

ISCST3 Industrial Source Complex Short Term (Model)

JCI Johnson Controls, Inc.

km kilometer

LAC Los Alamos County

LACEF Los Alamos Critical Experiments Facility

LADF Los Alamos Detonator Facility

LAMPF Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility (former name for LANSCE)

LAMPRE Los Alamos Molten Plutonium Reactor Experiment

LANL Los Alamos National Laboratory

LANSCE Los Alamos Neutron Science Center

lb pound

LCF latent cancer fatality

L/CHEM low chemical hazard

LCO limiting condition for operation

LDR land disposal restrictions

LEDA low-energy demonstration accelerator

L/ENS low energetic source hazard

LIDAR light detection and ranging

LIFT Los Alamos International Facility for Transmutation

linac linear accelerator

LLMW low-level radioactive mixed waste

LLNL Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

LLW low-level radioactive waste

LPSS Long-Pulse Spallation Source

L/RAD low radioactive hazard

LSA low specific activity

m meter

MAA Material Access Area

MACCS MELCOR Accident Consequences Code System

MAR material-at-risk

M/CHEM moderate chemical hazard

MCL maximum contaminant level

MDA Material Disposal Area

MEI maximally exposed individual

MeV million electron volts

MGD million gallons per day

MGY million gallons per year

mi mile

MLY million liters per year

MOU memorandum of understanding

MOX mixed oxide (fuel)

M/RAD moderate radioactive hazard

MSL Materials Science Laboratory

MW megawatt

NA not applicable (or not available)

NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards

NAGPRA Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

NCRP National Council on Radiation Protection

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended

NERP National Environmental Research Park

NESHAP National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants

NFPA National Fire Protection Association

NIOSH U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

NM New Mexico (State Road)

NMAC New Mexico Administrative Code

NMDGF New Mexico Department of Game and Fish

NMDL New Mexico Department of Labor

NMED New Mexico Environment Department

NMEIB New Mexico Environmental Improvement Board

NMSWA New Mexico Solid Waste Act

NMSF Nuclear Materials Storage Facility

NMWQCC New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission

NOA Notice of Availability

NOI Notice of Intent

NO<sub>x</sub> nitrogen oxides

NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

NPS National Park Service

NRC U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

NRHP National Register of Historic Places

NTS Nevada Test Site

NTTL neutron tube target loading

OEL occupational exposure limit

OLM Ozone Limiting Method

ORNL Oak Ridge National Laboratory

ORPS Occurrence Reporting and Processing System

OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Administration

OU operable unit

OWR Omega West Reactor

PA performance assessment

PAL plant-wide applicability limit

PCB polychlorinated biphenyl

PDD Presidential Decision Directive

PEIS programmatic environmental impact statement

PF Plutonium Facility

pH a measure of acidity and alkalinity

PHERMEX Pulsed High-Energy Radiation Machine Emitting X-Rays (facility)

PL public law

PM particulate matter

PM<sub>10</sub> particulate matter equal to or less than 10 micrometers aerodynamic

diameter

PNM Public Service Company of New Mexico

PPE personal protective equipment

ppb parts per billion

ppm parts per million

PRA probabilistic risk assessment

PrHA process hazard analysis

PRS potential release site

PSD prevention of significant deterioration

psi pounds per square inch

PSR proton storage ring

PSSC project-specific siting and construction

PTLA Protection Technology of Los Alamos

rad radiation absorbed dose

RAMROD Radioactive Materials Research, Operations, and Demonstration (facility)

RANT Radioactive Assay and Nondestructive Test (facility)

RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

rem roentgen equivalent man

RF radiofrequency (also, respirable fraction)

RfC inhalation reference concentrations

RFETS Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

RFI RCRA Facility Investigation

RH remote-handled (waste)

RH TRU remote-handled transuranic (waste)

RLW radioactive liquid waste

RLWTF Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility

ROD Record of Decision

ROI region of influence

RSRL regional statistical reference level

RTG radioisotopic thermoelectric generator

SA safety assessment

SAL screening action level

SAR safety analysis report

SARA Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act

SCC Strategic Computing Complex

SDWA Safe Drinking Water Act

SEER Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results

SEIS-II second supplemental environmental impact statement

SFNF Santa Fe National Forest

SHEBA Solution High-Energy Burst Assembly

SHPO State Historic Preservation Office(r)

SIP State Implementation Plan

SLEV screening level emission value

SMAC shipment mobility/accountability collection

SNM special nuclear material

SNS spallation neutron source

SPD surplus plutonium disposition

SPSS short-pulse spallation source

SSM Stockpile Stewardship and Management

SST safe secure transport

START Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (or Treaty)

STP Sewage Treatment Plant

SVOC semivolatile organic compound

SWDA Solid Waste Disposal Act

SWEIS site-wide environmental impact statement

SWMU solid waste management unit

SWPP Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

SWSC sanitary wastewater systems consolidation

T&E threatened and endangered (species)

TA Technical Area

TCP traditional cultural property

TEDE total effective dose equivalent

TFF Target Fabrication Facility

TI transport index

TLD thermoluminescent dosimeter

TLV threshold limit value

TRU transuranic (waste)

TSCA Toxic Substances Control Act

TSD treatment, storage, and disposal

TSFF Tritium Science and Fabrication Facility

TSR technical safety requirement

TSTA Tritium System Test Assembly

TW test well

TWA time-weighted average

TWISP Transuranic Waste Inspectable Storage Project

UC University of California

UCL upper confidence limit

UNM University of New Mexico

U.S. United States

U.S.C. United States Code

USFS U.S. Forest Service

USGS U.S. Geological Survey

UST underground storage tank

UV ultraviolet

VOC volatile organic compound

WAC waste acceptance criteria

WCRR Waste Characterization, Reduction, and Repackaging (facility)

WCTF Weapon Component Testing Facility

WETF Weapons Engineering Tritium Facility

WIPP Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

WM waste management

WNR Weapons Neutron Research

WR war reserve

WWTF Waste Water Treatment Facility

# VOLUME I MEASUREMENTS AND CONVERSIONS

The following information is provided to assist the reader in understanding certain concepts in this SWEIS. Definitions of technical terms can be found in volume I, chapter 10, Glossary.

#### **SCIENTIFIC NOTATION**

Scientific notation is used in this report to express very large or very small numbers. For example, the number 1 billion could be written as 1,000,000,000 or, using scientific notation, as  $1 \times 10^9$ . Translating from scientific notation to a more traditional number requires moving the decimal point either right (for a positive power of 10) or left (for a negative power of 10). If the value given is  $2.0 \times 10^3$ , move the decimal point three places (insert zeros if no numbers are given) to the right of its current location. The result would be 2,000. If the value given is  $2.0 \times 10^{-5}$ , move the decimal point five places to the left of its present location. The result would be 0.00002. An alternative way of expressing numbers, used primarily in the appendixes of this SWEIS, is exponential notation, which is very similar in use to scientific notation. For example, using the scientific notation for  $1 \times 10^9$ , in exponential notation the  $10^9$  (10 to the power of 9) would be replaced by E+09. (For positive powers, sometimes the "+" sign is omitted, and so the example here could be expressed as E09.) If the value is given as  $2.0 \times 10^{-5}$  in scientific notation, then the equivalent exponential notation is 2.0E-05.

#### Units of Measurement

The primary units of measurement used in this report are English units with metric equivalents enclosed in parentheses.

Many metric measurements presented include prefixes that denote a multiplication factor that is applied to the base standard (e.g., 1 kilometer = 1,000 meters). The following list presents these metric prefixes:

giga	1,000,000,000 (10 <sup>9</sup> ; E+09; one billion)
mega	1,000,000 (10 <sup>6</sup> ; E+06; one million)
kilo	1,000 (10 <sup>3</sup> ; E+03; one thousand)
hecto	100 (10 <sup>2</sup> ; E+02; one hundred)
deka	10 (10 <sup>1</sup> ; E+01; ten)
unit	1 (10 <sup>0</sup> ; E+00; one)
deci	0.1 (10 <sup>-1</sup> ; E-01; one tenth)
centi	0.01 (10 <sup>-2</sup> ; E-02; one hundredth)
milli	$0.001 (10^{-3}; E-03; one thousandth)$

micro 0.000001 (10<sup>-6</sup>; E-06; one millionth)

nano 0.000000001 (10<sup>-9</sup>; E-09; one billionth)

pico 0.00000000001 (10<sup>-12</sup>; E-12; one trillionth)

DOE Order 5900.2A, *Use of the Metric System of Measurement*, prescribes the use of this system in DOE documents. Table MC–1 lists the mathematical values or formulas needed for conversion between English and metric units. Table MC–2 summarizes and defines the terms for units of measure and corresponding symbols found throughout this report.

#### RADIOACTIVITY UNIT

Part of this report deals with levels of radioactivity that might be found in various environmental media. Radioactivity is a property; the amount of a radioactive material is usually expressed as "activity" in curies (Ci) (Table MC–3). The curie is the basic unit used to describe the amount of substance present, and concentrations are generally expressed in terms of curies per unit of mass or volume. One curie is equivalent to 37 billion disintegrations per second or is a quantity of any radionuclide that decays at the rate of 37 billion disintegrations per second. Disintegrations generally include emissions of alpha or beta particles, gamma radiation, or combinations of these.

#### **RADIATION DOSE UNITS**

The amount of ionizing radiation energy received by a living organism is expressed in terms of radiation dose. Radiation dose in this report is usually expressed in terms of effective dose equivalent and reported numerically in units of rem (Table MC–4). Rem is a term that relates ionizing radiation and biological effect or risk. A dose of 1 millirem (0.001 rem) has a biological effect similar to the dose received from about a 1-day exposure to natural background radiation. A list of the radionuclides discussed in this document and their half-lives is included in Table MC–5.

#### **CHEMICAL ELEMENTS**

A list of selected chemical elements, chemical constituents, and their nomenclature is presented in Table MC-6.

TABLE MC-1.—Conversion Table

MULTIPLY	BY	TO OBTAIN	MULTIPLY	BY	TO OBTAIN
ac	0.405	ha	ha	2.47	ac
°F	(°F -32) x 5/9	°C	°C	(°C x 9/5) + 32	°F
ft	0.305	m	m	3.28	ft
ft <sup>2</sup>	0.0929	$m^2$	$m^2$	10.76	ft <sup>2</sup>
ft <sup>3</sup>	0.0283	$m^3$	$m^3$	35.3	ft <sup>3</sup>
gal.	3.785	1	1	0.264	gal.
in.	2.54	cm	cm	0.394	in.
lb	0.454	kg	kg	2.205	lb
mCi/km <sup>2</sup>	1.0	nCi/m <sup>2</sup>	nCi/m <sup>2</sup>	1.0	mCi/km <sup>2</sup>
mi	1.61	km	km	0.621	mi
mi <sup>2</sup>	2.59	km <sup>2</sup>	km <sup>2</sup>	0.386	mi <sup>2</sup>
mi/h	0.447	m/s	m/s	2.237	mi/h
nCi	0.001	pCi	pCi	1,000	nCi
OZ	28.35	g	g	0.0353	OZ
pCi/l	10 <sup>-9</sup>	μCi/ml	μCi/ml	10 <sup>9</sup>	pCi/l
pCi/m <sup>3</sup>	10-12	Ci/m <sup>3</sup>	Ci/m <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	pCi/m <sup>3</sup>
pCi/m <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>-15</sup>	mCi/cm <sup>3</sup>	mCi/cm <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>15</sup>	pCi/m <sup>3</sup>
ppb	0.001	ppm	ppm	1,000	ppb
ton	0.907	metric ton	metric ton	1.102	ton

TABLE MC-2.—Names and Symbols for Units of Measure

LENGTH				
SYMBOL NAME				
cm	centimeter (1 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> m)			
ft	foot			
in.	inch			
km	kilometer (1 x 10 <sup>3</sup> m)			
m	meter			
mi	mile			
mm	millimeter (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> m)			
μm	micrometer (1 x 10 <sup>-6</sup> m)			
	VOLUME			
SYMBOL	Name			
cm <sup>3</sup>	cubic centimeter			
ft <sup>3</sup>	cubic foot			
gal.	gallon			
in. <sup>3</sup>	cubic inch			
1	liter			
$m^3$	cubic meter			
ml	milliliter (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> l)			
ppb	parts per billion			
ppm	parts per million			
yd <sup>3</sup> cubic yard				
	RATE			
Symbol	Name			
Ci/yr	curies per year			
cm <sup>3</sup> /s	cubic meters per second			
ft <sup>3</sup> /s	cubic feet per second			
ft <sup>3</sup> /min	cubic feet per minute			
gpm	gallons per minute			
kg/yr	kilograms per year			
km/h	kilometers per hour			
mg/l	milligrams per liter			
MGY	million gallons per year			
MLY	million liters per year			
m <sup>3</sup> /yr	cubic meters per year			
mi/h or mph	miles per hour			
μCi/l	microcuries per liter			
pCi/l	picocuries per liter			

TABLE MC-2.—Names and Symbols for Units of Measure-Continued

NUMERICAL RELATIONSHIPS					
SYMBOL MEANING					
<	less than				
≤ > ≥	greater than				
≥	greater than or equal to				
2σ	two standard deviations				
	TIME				
SYMBOL NAME					
d	day				
h	hour				
min	minute				
nsec	nanosecond				
s	second				
yr	year				
	AREA				
Symbol	Name				
ac	acre (640 per mi <sup>2</sup> )				
cm <sup>2</sup>	square centimeter				
ft <sup>2</sup>	square foot				
ha	hectare $(1 \times 10^4 \text{ m}^2)$				
in. <sup>2</sup>	square inch				
km <sup>2</sup>	square kilometer				
mi <sup>2</sup>	square mile				
	MASS				
SYMBOL	Name				
g	gram				
kg	kilogram (1 x 10 <sup>3</sup> g)				
mg	milligram (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> g)				
μg	microgram (1 x 10 <sup>-6</sup> g)				
ng	nanogram (1 x 10 <sup>-9</sup> g)				
lb	pound				
ton	metric ton (1 x 10 <sup>6</sup> g)				
OZ	ounce				

TABLE MC-2.—Names and Symbols for Units of Measure-Continued

TEMPERATURE				
SYMBOL NAME				
°C	degrees Celsius			
°F degrees Fahrenheit				
°K	K degrees Kelvin			
SOUND/NOISE				
SYMBOL NAME				
dB	decibel			
dBA A-weighted decibel				

TABLE MC-4.—Names and Symbols for Units of Radiation Dose

RADIATION DOSE				
SYMBOL NAME				
mrad	millirad (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> rad)			
mrem	millirem (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> rem)			
R	roentgen			
mR	milliroentgen (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> R)			
μR	microroentgen (1 x 10 <sup>-6</sup> R)			

TABLE MC-3.—Names and Symbols for Units of Radioactivity

RADIOACTIVITY				
SYMBOL NAME				
Ci	curie			
cpm	counts per minute			
mCi	millicurie (1 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> Ci)			
μCi	microcurie (1 x 10 <sup>-6</sup> Ci)			
nCi	nanocurie (1 x 10 <sup>-9</sup> Ci)			
pCi	picocurie (1 x 10 <sup>-12</sup> Ci)			

TABLE MC-5.—Radionuclide Nomenclature

SYMBOL	RADIONUCLIDE	HALF-LIFE	SYMBOL	RADIONUCLIDE	HALF-LIFE
Am-241	americium-241	432 yr	Pu-241	plutonium-241	14.4 yr
H-3	tritium	12.26 yr	Pu-242	plutonium-242	3.8 x 10 <sup>5</sup> yr
Mo-99	molybdenum-99	66 hr	Pu-244	plutonium-244	8.2 x 10 <sup>7</sup> yr
Pa-234	protactinium-234	6.7 hr	Th-231	thorium-231	25.5 hr
Pa-234m	protactinium-234m	1.17 min	Th-234	thorium-234	24.1 d
Pu-236	plutonium-236	2.9yr	U-234	uranium-234	2.4 x 10 <sup>5</sup> yr
Pu-238	plutonium-238	87.7 yr	U-235	uranium-234	7 x 10 <sup>8</sup> yr
Pu-239	plutonium-239	$2.4 \times 10^4 \text{ yr}$	U-238	uranium-238	4.5 x 10 <sup>9</sup> yr
Pu-240	plutonium-240	$6.5 \times 10^3 \text{ yr}$			

Table MC-6.—Elemental and Chemical Constituent Nomenclature

SYMBOL	CONSTITUENT	SYMBOL	CONSTITUENT
Ag	silver	Pa	protactinium
Al	aluminum	Pb	lead
Ar	argon	Pu	plutonium
В	boron	SF <sub>6</sub>	sulfur hexafluoride
Be	beryllium	Si	silicon
СО	carbon monoxide	SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide	Та	tantalum
Cu	copper	Th	thorium
F	fluorine	Ti	titanium
Fe	iron	U	uranium
Kr	krypton	V	vanadium
N	nitrogen	W	tungsten
Ni	nickel	Xe	xenon
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrite ion	Zn	zinc
NO <sub>3</sub> -	nitrate ion	1	

### ABOUT THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] §4321 *et seq.*) was enacted to ensure that federal decision makers consider the effects of proposed actions on the human environment and to lay their decisionmaking process open for public scrutiny. NEPA also created the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) NEPA regulations (10 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1021) augment the CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1500 through 1508).

Under NEPA, an environmental impact statement (EIS) documents a federal agency's analysis of the environmental consequences that might be caused by major federal actions, defined as those proposed actions that may result in a significant impact to the environment. An EIS also:

- Explains the purpose and need for the agency to take action.
- Describes the proposed action and the reasonable alternative courses of action that the agency could take to meet the need.
- Describes what would happen if the proposed action were not implemented—the "No Action" (or status quo) Alternative.
- Describes what aspects of the human environment would be affected if the proposed action or any alternative were implemented.
- Analyzes the changes, or impacts, to the environment that would be expected to take place if the proposed action or an alternative were implemented, compared to the expected condition of the environment if no action were taken.

#### The DOE EIS process follows these steps:

- The Notice of Intent, published in the *Federal Register*, identifies potential EIS issues and alternatives and asks for public comment on the scope of the analysis.
- The public scoping period, with at least one public meeting, during which public comments on the scope of the document are collected and considered.
- The issuance of a draft EIS for public review and comment (for a minimum of 45 days), with at least one public hearing.
- The preparation and issuance of the final EIS, which incorporates the results of the public comment period on the draft EIS.
- Preparation and issuance of a Record of Decision, which states:
  - The decision.
  - The alternatives that were considered in the EIS and the environmentally preferable alternative.
  - All decision factors, such as cost and technical considerations, that were considered by the agency along with environmental consequences.
  - Mitigation measures designed to reduce adverse environmental impacts.
- Preparation of a Mitigation Action Plan, as appropriate, which explains how the mitigation measures will be implemented and monitored.